

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 29 and 39 have been amended. Claims 6, 12, 18, 26, 36 and 45 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-17, 19-25, 27-35, 37-44 and 46 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-46 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,681,109 issued to Leifer (*Leifer*) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0171126 of Blink, et al. (*Blink*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1-46 are not rendered obvious by *Leifer* and *Blink*.

Claim 1 recites:

generating service availability information corresponding to at least an estimated time until the requested services are available in response to receiving the customer information wherein the service availability information comprises one or more of an estimated wait time, a distance between the service establishment and the wireless device, a service status, a location of the service establishment and a location of the wireless device...

Thus, Applicants claim generating various types of service availability information.

Claims 7, 13, 19, 29 and 39 recite similar limitations.

Applicants agree with the Office Action that *Leifer* does not disclose service availability information. See pages 3-4. While *Blank* discloses paging customers when a table is ready, *Blank* does not provide service availability information as recited in the claims. See paragraph 0046. Specifically, *Blank* does not disclose providing an

estimated wait time to the customer via a wireless device. Because neither *Leifer* nor *Blank* discloses providing various types of service availability information, no combination of *Leifer* and *Blank* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 29 and 39.

The remaining claims are dependent claims that depend from the independent claims discussed above. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that the dependent claims are not rendered obvious by *Leifer* and *Blank* for at least the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-17, 19-25, 27-35, 37-44 and 46 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: April 17, 2007

/Paul A. Mendonsa/
Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778